

Serial No. **10/029,199**
Amdt. dated January 26, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 1, 2005

Docket No. **HI-0065**

REMARKS

By the present response, Applicant has canceled claims 7 and 9 without disclaimer. Further, claims 1, 4, 5, 8 and 10-17 have been amended to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-6, 8 and 10-17 remain pending in the present application.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 4-6 and 12-17 have been rejected because of informalities. Claims 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0057664 (Sarkar). Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarkar.

Claims 9-10 and 12-17 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner indicates that claims 1-3 and 4-7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the claim objections cited in this Office Action.

Allowable subject matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that claims 9, 10 and 12-17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and that claims 1-3 and 4-7 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the claim objections cited in this Office Action. Applicant submits that claims 1-3

Serial No. **10/029,199**
Amdt. dated January 26, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 1, 2005

Docket No. **HI-0065**

and 4-7 have been amended to overcome the claim objections, therefore, putting these claims in condition for allowance.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 4-6, and 12-17 have been objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended these claims to further clarify the invention and respectfully requests that these objections be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sarkar. Applicant has amended this claim to incorporate the subject matter of claim 9 deemed allowable by the Examiner and, therefore, claim 8 is patentable over the cited reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

35 U.S. C. § 103 Rejections

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Sarkar. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that this claim is dependent on independent claim 8 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Serial No. **10/029,199**
Amdt. dated January 26, 2006
Reply to Office Action of November 1, 2005

Docket No. **HI-0065**

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1-6, 8 and 10-17 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tfg
Date: January 26, 2006

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610